



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/009,932	01/21/1998	KOICHIRO TANAKA	35G2116	8061

5514 7590 09/16/2003

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

VU, NGOC YEN T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2612

16 ✓ / 7

DATE MAILED: 09/16/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/009,932

Applicant(s)

Koichiro TANAKA et al.

Examiner

Ngoc-Yen Vu

Art Unit

2612

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jul 11, 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 18-70 ~~is/are~~ pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 18-27, 30-33, 35-46, 49-52, 54-63, and 66-69 ~~is/are~~ rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 28, 29, 34, 47, 48, 53, 64, 65, and 70 ~~is/are~~ objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2612

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 07/11/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to the Morino '401 reference, the Applicants argue that Morino fails to disclose or suggest the feature of "detecting a figure *scripted on a display screen*" (emphasis added). The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Morino teaches in figures 6-7 that a user can control the direction and the velocity of a remoter camera by dragging a mouse on a display screen. By dragging the mouse on the screen, the user creates a figure which is scripted on the display screen (see Fig. 7).

In view of the reasoning above, the Examiner believes that the broadest interpretation of the present claimed invention does in fact read on the cited references for at least the reasons discussed above and as stated in the detailed Office action as follows. ***This Office action is now made final.*** The Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
3. Claims 18-21, 35-40 and 54-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morino et al. (US #6,400,401).

Art Unit: 2612

Regarding claims 18-21, Morino '401 teaches a camera control system (Fig. 2, control apparatus 2) comprising a display device (16) that displays an image sensed by a camera (12), in accordance with an image signal output from the camera (col. 2 line 42 - col. 3 line 20; col. 4 lines 62+); a detection device (CPU 21) that detects a figure scripted on a display screen on which the image is being displayed by said display device (col. 3 line 20 - col. 4 line 24; col. 5 line 34 - col. 6 line 19); a selection device (CPU 21) that collates a pattern of the figure detected by said detection device with figure patterns (see Figs. 3B, 5 & 7), and selects a command to control a predetermined function of the camera in accordance with a figure pattern which corresponds to the detected figure (col. 4 lines 24-59; col. 5 line 1 - col. 6 line 67); and an output device (I/O 24) that outputs the command (col. 2 line 67 - col. 3 line 9; col. 6 lines 9-15).

Claims 18-21 differ from Morino '401 in that the claims require that the figure patterns are previously stored in a storage device. Although Morino does not explicitly teach that the figure patterns are stored in a storage device, Morino teaches that the screen 16a of the display 16 can be divided into four zones (Fig. 3B) or nine zones (Fig. 5) to construct a GUI for controlling the camera(s) 12. Morino further teaches that the workstation (20) includes a ROM 22 for storing programs to be executed by the CPU 21, and various data are stored in the RAM 23 (col. 2 lines 64+). Since Morino teaches that two or more GUIs can be constructed for controlling the camera(2), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the camera control system taught in Morino by allowing the workstation (20) to store in a storage device, such as ROM 22 or RAM 23, figure patterns or GUIs for controlling a predetermined function of

Art Unit: 2612

the camera, thus providing a simple and rapid way of setting the panning, tilting, zooming or focusing parameters for the camera as desired by the users.

Regarding claims 35-40 and 54-57, they are method claims corresponding to claims 18-21 in which the subject matter can be found in claims 1-4. It is noted that the Morino '401 teaches that the present invention can be achieved by providing a storage medium storing program codes for performing the camera control processes (col. 7 lines 6-35).

4. Claims 26-27, 30-33, 45-46, 49-52, 62-63 and 66-69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morino '401, as applied to claims 18, 35 and 54 above, and further in view of Cortjens et al. (US #5,568,183).

As to claims 26-27, the claims differ from the Morino reference in that the claims require if said detection device detects an arrow is scripted on the display screen, then said output device outputs a control command for control of at least one of pan and tilt of the camera according to the direction of the detected arrow, wherein said output means determines a controlled amount of at least one of the pan and tilt of the camera according to a length of the detected arrow.

However, it is well known in the art to include a graphical user interface for configuration and control of a camera using scripted arrows on the display screen, as taught in Cortjens (col. 14 line 55 - col. 16 line 56). In light of the teaching from Cortjens, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the camera control system taught in the Morino reference by controlling the camera(s) using a graphical user interface having scripted arrows.

Art Unit: 2612

As to claims 30-31, Cortjens teaches that if said detection device detects a substantially rectangular figure is scripted on the display screen, then said output device outputs a command for controlling a zoom ratio according to a size of the substantially rectangular figure detected, wherein if said detection device detects a substantially rectangular figure is scripted on the display screen, then said output device further outputs a control command for performing at least one of pan and tilt of the camera such that an image displayed at a center of the substantially rectangular figure is positioned at a center of the display surface (col. 16 line 57 - col. 18 line 47).

As to claims 32-33, Cortjens teaches that if said detection device detects a crisscross figure is scripted on the display screen, then said output device outputs a command for controlling a zoom ratio in the zoom-out direction according to a size of the crisscross figure detected, wherein said output means outputs a control command for performing at least one of pan and tilt of the camera such that an image displayed at a point of intersection of the two segments forming the crisscross figure is positioned at the center of the display surface (col. 16 line 57 - col. 18 line 47).

Regarding claims 45-46, they are method claims of the apparatus claims 26-27, respectively. Therefore, they are analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to the apparatus claims 26-27.

Regarding claims 49-52, they are method claims of the apparatus claims 30-33, respectively. Therefore, they are analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to the apparatus claims 30-33.

Art Unit: **2612**

Regarding claims **62-63**, they are method claims of the apparatus claims 26-27, respectively. Therefore, they are analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to the apparatus claims 26-27.

Regarding claims **66-69**, they are method claims of the apparatus claims 30-33, respectively. Therefore, they are analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to the apparatus claims 30-33. It is noted that the Morino '401 teaches that the present invention can be achieved by providing a storage medium storing program codes for performing the camera control processes (col. 7 lines 6-35).

5. Claims 22-25, 41-44, and 58-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morino '401 in view of Cortjens '183, as applied to claims 18, 35 and 54 above, and further in view of Kawai et al. (JP # 4-302587).

As to claims **22-25**, Cortjens teaches that if an action of depicting a segment from right to left, from left to right, from bottom to top or from top to bottom on the display surface of said display means, then the output means outputs a command for leftward pan, rightward pan, upward tilt or downward tilt control, respectively of the camera (col. 14, line 55 - col. 16 line 56). However, claims 5-8 differ from Morino and Cortjens in that the claims further require that these pan and tilt commands are output from the output means according to the length of the segment. The limitation is well known in the art as shown in Kawai. In the same field of endeavor, Kawai '587 teaches a video camera control system for controlling a video camera (4) (see Fig. 1)

Art Unit: 2612

wherein the commands for controlling the camera are input via a mouse 9 on a window 7 of a screen 6 (see the translated copy of Kawai on pages 2-4). In figures 4-5, Kawai further teaches that the window has segments from A to I, wherein the pan and tilt commands for controlling the camera 4 are outputted according to the length of these segments (see pages 5-7). In light of the teaching from Kawai, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the camera control system taught in the Morino reference and Cortjens by outputting upward and downward pan/tilt commands according to the length of the segment so as allow the user to specifically designate the pan and tilt amounts using a mouse on a display device.

Regarding claims 41-44, they are method claims of the apparatus claims 22-25, respectively. Therefore, they are analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to the apparatus claims 22-25.

Regarding claims 58-61, they are method claims of the apparatus claims 22-25, respectively. Therefore, they are analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to the apparatus claims 22-25. It is noted that the Morino '401 teaches that the present invention can be achieved by providing a storage medium storing program codes for performing the camera control processes (col. 7 lines 6-35).

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 28-29, 34, 47-48, 53, 64-65 and 70 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 2612

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8. **Any response to this office action should be mailed to:**

Box AF

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314, (for formal communications intended for entry)

(for informal or draft communications, please label

"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Art Unit: 2612

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington.
VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Ngoc-Yen Vu** whose telephone number is (703) 305-4946. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri from 8 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Wendy Garber**, can be reached on (703) 305-4929.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the customer service office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

NYV
09/12/02003


NGOC-YEN VU
PRIMARY EXAMINER